# OFIGINAL

### OPEN MEETING AGENDA ITEM



### ARIZONA CORPORATION CO BEFORE THE

2

**COMMISSIONERS** Arizona Corporation Commission

RECEIVED

3

**BOB STUMP** 

DOUG LITTLE, Chairman DOCKETED

DOCKETED BY

2016 JAN 29 A 11:58

4

**BOB BURNS** TOM FORESE JAN **29** 2016

AZ CORP COMMISSION DOCKET CONTROL

5 6

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF JOHNSON UTILITIES, L.L.C., FOR AN DOCKET NO. WS-02987A-08-0180

7 8

INCREASE IN ITS WATER AND WASTE-**FOR CUSTOMERS RATES** WATER WITHIN PINAL COUNTY, ARIZONA.

**EXCEPTIONS OF JOHNSON UTILITIES** TO STAFF'S REPORT AND ORDER RE CAGRD ADJUSTER

9

10 11

12

13

14

CROCKETT LAW GROUP PLLC 2198 E. Camelback Road, Suite 305 Phoenix, Arizona 85016 602.441.2775

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

On October 8, 2015, Johnson Utilities, L.L.C. ("Johnson Utilities" or "Company") filed with the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") its proposed Central Arizona Groundwater Replenishment District ("CAGRD") adjustor fees for the Phoenix and Pinal Active Management Areas ("AMAs") to become effective December 1, 2015. In its filing, Johnson Utilities reported that it collected \$3,191,879.44 less in CAGRD fees from customers in the Phoenix AMA for the time period 2011-2014 than it paid to the CAGRD in taxes over the same period. After minor adjustments, the amount of the under-collection was subsequently adjusted downward to \$3,148,053.63.

The Company also reported in its filing that it collected \$262,617.94 less in CAGRD fees from customers in the Pinal AMA for the 2011-2014 time period than it paid to the CAGRD in taxes over the same period. After minor adjustments, the amount of the under-collection was subsequently adjusted upward slightly to \$262,915.26. The total amount of the under-collection for 2011-2014 for both the Phoenix and Pinal AMAs is \$3,410,968.89 as shown on the spreadsheet attached hereto as Attachment 1. Upon information and belief, Johnson Utilities does not believe that there is any dispute between Utilities Division Staff ("Staff") and the Company regarding these numbers.

On November 6, 2015, Johnson Utilities filed a notice consenting to an extension of the time for filing the Staff Report and Order on the Company's proposal.

In calculating the new CAGRD adjuster fees for the upcoming 12-month period, Johnson Utilities included the under-collected amounts from the 2011-2014 time period. This produced a CAGRD adjuster fee of \$3.23 per 1,000 gallons for the Phoenix AMA and \$1.75 per 1,000 gallons for the Pinal AMA. However, in order to lessen the rate impact to customers, Johnson Utilities proposed to recover the under-collected amounts over two years. Thus, the Company has proposed a CAGRD adjuster fee of \$2.57 per 1,000 gallons for the Phoenix AMA and \$1.23 per 1,000 gallons for the Pinal AMA.

On January 19, 2016, Utilities Division Staff ("Staff") filed its Staff Report and Order addressing Johnson Utilities' filing. Staff rejected the Company's request as submitted and instead recommended CAGRD adjuster fees of \$1.61 per 1,000 gallons for the Phoenix AMA and \$0.91 per 1,000 gallons for the Pinal AMA. However, Staff's recommended adjuster fees leave Johnson Utilities with significant under-collected CAGRD taxes in both the Phoenix and Pinal AMAs, and they virtually ensure that the under-collection problem will grow worse. This is clearly contrary to the Commission's express language in Decision 71854 which states as follows:

The CAGRD assessment fee is not discretionary for companies such as Johnson Utilities, and the Commission believes that the CAGRD participation represents the kind of investment that is appropriate for timely cost recovery. To not allow the Company to recover its CAGRD costs in real time may threaten the Company's ability to participate in the CAGRD program and would send a negative signal to water providers regarding this Commission's support for sound regional approaches to achieving safe yield in Active Management Areas.<sup>2</sup>

In prior years, Johnson Utilities has calculated its CAGRD adjuster fees based upon a methodology that was prescribed by Staff. This flawed methodology—which offsets nearly two years of CAGRD adjuster fee revenue against the CAGRD assessment for a single year—has caused the current situation where the Company has collected \$3.4 million less from customers than the taxes it has paid the CAGRD for the same time period. This is not "timely cost recovery" as required in Decision 71854. Moreover, if the calculation methodology does not change, the under-collection will grow larger and larger.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Decision 71854 at 44, lines 2-8 (emphasis added).

Staff states in its Report and Order that "[i]n its 2015 CAGRD adjuster reset, the Company is proposing a new calculation methodology that will match the CAGRD collections for a specific year to the CAGRD invoice that was generated by the usage for that year." That is correct. The methodology used by Johnson Utilities to calculate the proposed new CAGRD adjuster fees is more appropriate because it properly matches the amounts paid by customers under the CAGRD adjuster in a single calendar year to the CAGRD tax bill for that same calendar year. This methodology is fully consistent with Condition 6 of Decision 71854 which states as follows:

The CAGRD adjustor fees shall be calculated as follows: The total CAGRD fees for the most current year in the Phoenix AMA shall be divided by the gallons sold in that year to determine a CAGRD fee per 1,000 gallons. Similarly, the total CAGRD fees for the most current year in the Pinal AMA shall be divided by the gallons sold in that year to determine a CAGRD fee per 1,000 gallons.<sup>4</sup>

Johnson Utilities receives its CAGRD tax bill 8-9 months after the end of the year to which the bill applies. For example, the Company received its CAGRD tax bill for the 2014 calendar year in August 2015. Applying Condition 6 above, Johnson Utilities matched the fees paid by customers under the CAGRD adjuster in 2014 with the tax bill for 2014. This methodology is easy to apply and it follows the matching principal in utility accounting. For these reasons, the methodology utilized by Johnson Utilities is better than the methodology utilized by Staff.

Staff also states in its Report and Order that "any proposed alterations to the current calculation methodology and any cumulative true-up would be more appropriately addressed within the context of a full rate case where the CAGRD adjustor mechanism can be considered along with all other rate issues." Staff's view is contrary to the express language of Decision 71854 quoted above which makes clear that CAGRD costs should be recovered "timely" and "in real time." Moreover, delaying the issue will virtually guarantee that the Commission is addressing an under-collection approaching \$5 million by 2017 at the very same time that it is addressing a requested rate increase by the Company. Johnson Utilities would add also that there is no need to modify Decision 71854 to allow the methodology utilized by Johnson Utilities. In fact, the Company's methodology more closely adheres to the language of the decision than that

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Staff Report and Order (January 19, 2016) at 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Decision 71854 at 38, lines 22-26.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Staff Report and Order (January 19, 2016) at 3.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

required by Staff. For all of these reasons, Johnson Utilities urges the Commission to reject Staff's proposal that this urgent problem be addressed in a future rate case.

Johnson Utilities would also point out that the Company already files two reports in the docket each year concerning the amounts collected under the CAGRD adjuster and the amounts disbursed to pay CAGRD tax assessments. Thus, there are ample opportunities for Staff to verify that the CAGRD adjuster mechanism is functioning as intended by the Commission and that the interests of rate payers are protected.

Johnson Utilities requests that the Commission approve the methodology used by the Company to calculate the CAGRD adjuster fees for the coming 12-month period as well as the proposed true-up to recover the under-collected CAGRD taxes over the next two years. This produces a CAGRD adjuster fee for the Phoenix AMA of \$2.57 per 1,000 gallons and a fee of \$1.23 for the Pinal AMA. For the Commission's convenience and consideration, attached hereto as Attachment 2 is Johnson Utilities' Proposed Amendment No. 1 which makes the requested changes to the order included with the Staff Report and Order.

RESPECTFULLY submitted this 29th day of January, 2016.

CROCKETT LAW GROUP PLLC

Jeffrey W. Crockert, Esq. 21% East Camelback Road, Suite 305

Phoenix, Arizona 85016-4747

Attorney for Johnson Utilities, L.L.C.

ORIGINAL and thirteen (13) copies filed this 29th day of January, 2016, with:

**Docket Control** ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007

COPIES of the foregoing hand-delivered this 29th day of January, 2016, to:

Dwight Nodes, Chief Administrative Law Judge Hearing Division ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 1200 West Washington Street

28 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

1	Janice Alward, Chief Counsel			
2	Legal Division ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION			
3	1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007			
4	Thomas M. Broderick, Director			
5	Utilities Division ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION			
6	1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007			
7	COPIES of the foregoing mailed via first class U.S. mail this 29 <sup>th</sup> day of January, 2016, to:			
8				
9	Daniel Pozefsky, Chief Counsel RESIDENTIAL UTILITY CONSUMER OFFICE 1110 West Washington Street, Suite 220			
10	Phoenix, Arizona 85007			
11	Florence Town Attorney TOWN OF FLORENCE			
12	775 N. Main Street P.O. Box 2670			
13	Florence, Arizona 85253			
14	Craig A. Marks, Esq. CRAIG A. MARKS, PLC			
15	10645 N. Tatum Blvd., Suite 200-676 Phoenix, Arizona 85028			
16	,			
17	116 +			
18	Left Would			
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

# **ATTACHMENT 1**

a. 2014 CAGRD Invoice b. Cumulative Under-collection (2011-2014) c. Amount to be recovered 2014 d. Total water sold in 2014 (1,000 gallons0 e. Charge per 1,000 gallons [C÷D]	Cumulative (Combined AMA's)  CAGRD Invoice Fees Collected From Customers Over/(Under) Collections	Pinal AMA  CAGRD Invoice Fees Collected from Customers Over/(Under) Collections	Phoenix AMA  CAGRD Invoice Fees Collected from Customers  Over/(Under) Collections	Concession of Fees
\$ 4,599,237.44 \$ 4,599,237.44 \$ 4,599,237.44 \$ 4,599,237.44 2,409,289 \$ 1.91	\$ 3,143,861.74 \$ 1,798,680.28 \$ (1,345,181.46)	\$ 72,995.62 \$ 56,219.38 \$ (16,776.24)	<b>2011</b> \$ 3,070,866.12 \$ 1,742,460.90 \$ (1,328,405.22)	
Phoenix AMA  Cumulative  \$ 4,599,237.44  \$ 3,148,053.63  .44  \$ 7,747,291.07  .89  2,409,289  .91  \$ 3.22	\$ 3,230,222.20 \$ 2,042,681.79 \$ (1,187,540.41)	\$ 117,186.64 \$ 57,719.01 \$ (59,467.63)	\$ 3,113,035.56 \$ 1,984,962.78 \$ (1,128,072.78)	
	\$4,276,190.33 \$3,827,825.94 \$ (448,364.39)	\$ 99,681.03 \$ 86,274.94 \$ (13,406.09)	\$4,176,509.30 \$3,741,551.00 \$ (434,958.30)	
\$ 321,496.59 \$ 321,496.59 \$ 323,496.59 \$ 323,894 \$ 0.97	\$ 4,920,734.03 \$ 4,490,851.40 \$ (429,882.63)	\$ 321,496.59 \$ 148,231.29 \$ (173,265.30)	\$ 4,599,237.44 \$ 4,342,620.11 \$ (256,617.33)	
Pinal AMA  Cumulative  9 \$ 321,496.59  \$ 262,915.26  9 \$ 584,411.85  94 332,894  1.76	<b>Total</b> \$ 15,571,008.30 \$ 12,160,039.41 \$ (3,410,968.89)	\$ 611,359.88 \$ 348,444.62 \$ (262,915.26)	Total \$ 14,959,648.42 \$ 11,811,594.79 \$ (3,148,053.63)	

# Condition No. 6 in Decision No. 71854 (08/25/2010)

determine a CAGRD fee per 1,000 gallons. Similarly, the total CAGRD fees for the most current year in the Pinal AMA shall be divided by the gallons sold in that year to "The CAGRD adjustor fee shall be calculated as follows: The total CAGRD fee for the most current year in the Phoenix AMA shall be divided by the gallons sold in that year to determine a CAGRD fee per 1,000 gallons."

## **ATTACHMENT 2**

#### PROPOSED AMENDMENT # 1

DATE PREPARED: January 29, 2016

COMPANY:

Johnson Utilities, L.L.C.

DOCKET NO.:

WS-02987A-08-0180

OPEN MEETING DATES: February 2-3, 2016

AGENDA ITEM:

U-14

Page 2, line 5,

ADD a new Finding of Fact No. 3 as follows:

3. On January 19, 2016, Utilities Division Staff ("Staff") filed a Staff Report and Order recommending CAGRD fees different than those proposed by the Company. On January 29, 2016, the Company filed exceptions to the Staff Report and Order.

RENUMBER the remaining Findings of Fact.

Page 3, lines 10-11,

DELETE "The Commission-approved calculation follows condition No. 6 of Decision No. 71854, which" and REPLACE WITH "Staff's calculation"

Page 3, line 18,

DELETE "\$3,191,879" and REPLACE WITH "\$3,148,054"

Page 3, line 19,

DELETE "\$262,618" and REPLACE WITH "\$262,915"

Page 3, line 20,

DELETE "\$3.23" and REPLACE WITH "\$3.22"

Page 3, line 20,

DELETE "\$1.75" and REPLACE WITH "\$1.76"

Page 4, line 11,

ADD a new Finding of Fact 10 as follows:

10. The Company asserts that Staff's methodology is flawed because it offsets nearly two years of CAGRD adjuster fee revenue against the CAGRD assessment for a single year, which has created the current situation where the Company has collected \$3,410,969 less from customers than what it has paid the CAGRD for the same time period. In addition, the Company believes that Staff's recommendation to address the issue in a future rate case should be rejected because a delay in cost recovery is contrary to the express language of Decision 71854 which states that CAGRD costs should be recovered timely and in real time, because delaying the issue will make the current undercollection a larger problem to deal with in the rate case, and because the Company's methodology is consistent with Decision 71854 and thus requires no modification of the decision.

RENUMBER the remaining Findings of Fact.

Page 8, line 7,

DELETE Conclusion and Recommendation No. 6 on line 7 and REPLACE WITH the following:

6. We find that the Company's requested CAGRD adjuster fees are reasonable and should be adopted.

Page 8, line 22,

DELETE "\$1.61" and REPLACE WITH "\$2.57"

Page 8, line 22,

DELETE "\$0.91" and REPLACE WITH "\$1.23"

Make all other conforming changes.